

REMARKS

We are in receipt of the Office Action dated May 20, 2003, and the above amendment and the following remarks are made in light thereof.

Claims 1-198 are pending in the application, with claims 1-48, 115-118 and 179-198 having been previously withdrawn from consideration pursuant to an election.

In the Office Action, claims 60-70 and 129-138 are objected to for being substantial duplicates of claims 71-92 and 139-158. Claims 93-103 and 159-168 are objected to for being substantial duplicates of claims 104-114 and 169-178.

Claims 49-59 and 119-128 are provisionally rejected for double patenting for claiming the same invention as that of claims 1-64 of copending Application No. 10/097,641. Claims 60-114 and 129-178 are provisionally rejected for obviousness-type double patenting over claims 1-64 of copending Application No. 10/097,641.

In response to the objection to claims 60-70, 129-138, 71-92 and 139-158, applicant makes the following comments. In this group of claims there are three independent claims, claims 60, 71 and 82. Claims 61-70 and 129-138 are dependent from claim 60; claims 72-81 and 139-148 are dependent from claim 71; and claims 83-92 and 149-158 are dependent from claim 82. To

overcome the examiner's objection to these claims, applicant has amended claims 60 and 71 in order to clarify the differences in the step sequencing of the two claims. In addition, applicant believes that claim 82 is not a substantial duplicate of either claims 60 or 71, as claim 82 requires "crystallizing the amorphous semiconductor form by a heat treatment to form a crystalline semiconductor form and moving the catalytic element to the semiconductor film containing the lower gas element". This is not found in either of claims 60 or 71.

With respect to the objection to claims 93-103 and 159-168 as being substantial duplicates of claims 104-114 and 169-178, applicant offers the following comments. Claim 93 is an independent claim, with claims 94-103 and 159-168 depending therefrom. Claim 104 is an independent with claims 105-114 and 169-178 depending therefrom. Applicant submits that claims 93 and 104 are not substantial duplicates, as claim 104 recites the step of adding a rare gas element to the semiconductor film containing the rare gas element, which is not found in claim 93.

With respect to the rejection of claims 49-114 and 119-178 for double patenting over copending Application No. 10/097,641, applicant requests that this rejection be held in abeyance until one of the Application No. 10/097,641 and the present application is allowed.

Accordingly, applicant believes that it has fully responded to the outstanding Office Action, and reconsideration and allowance of the application is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 16 September 2003



Stephen B. Heller
Attorney of Record
Registration No.: 30,181
COOK, ALEX, McFARRON, MANZO,
CUMMINGS & MEHLER, LTD.
200 West Adams Street, Suite 2850
Chicago, Illinois 60606
(312) 236-8500